

Appl. No. 10/646,008
 Response dated: September 2, 2005
 Reply to Office action of June 2, 2005

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present Application. Claim 1 has been amended and Claims 6, 16, 17 and 23-25 are withdrawn, leaving Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18-22 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment and following remarks.

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Restrictions

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application and have been restricted. Applicant has elected Group I drawn to Claims 1-22 and Figure 6 relating to Claims 1-16 and 18-22. In the present Office Action, it is asserted that Claims 6 and 16 are directed to a nonelected species and therefore have been withdrawn. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion.

Figures 3 and 6 illustrate exemplary embodiments of the invention. As disclosed in the Specification, when an element is referred to as being "on" another element, it can be directly on the other element or intervening elements may also be present. (Page 7, lines 2-5.) Referring to the description of the exemplary embodiment FIG. 3, each data FPC film 510 is provided with a data IC 540 mounted thereon (Page 9, line 25), four gate driving ICs 440 are mounted on the liquid crystal display panel 300 (Page 10, line 19) and different from the exemplary embodiment of FIG. 3, the data driving ICs 540 may be mounted on the liquid crystal display pane 300 rather than on the FPC film 510 (Page 11, lines 26-27.) That is, "drivers mounted on the flexible printed circuit film" is an embodiment of the invention, not directed towards a different species of the invention.

Appl. No. 10/646,008
Response dated: September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 2, 2005

According to an exemplary embodiment, as further described in the specification, pixel electrode 190, an auxiliary gate pad 95, an auxiliary data pad 97, auxiliary pads 96 and 98 of the data driving wire *and* a connecting member 94 are formed on the protective layer 180. (Page 17, lines 19-21.) FIGs 4-6 show enlarged portions and sectional views of FIG. 3. FIGs 4-6 clearly illustrate the "the first connecting line comprises a connecting member that is formed as a same layer with the pixel electrodes" as recited in Claim 16. That is, "a connecting member that is formed as a same layer with the pixel electrodes" is an embodiment of the invention, not directed towards a different species of the invention.

Therefore, Claims 6 and 16 are not directed to different species of the invention. Reconsideration of the withdrawal and return of Claims 6 and 16 to pending status is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by Imajo et al., US 2001/0015709 (hereinafter "Imajo") for the reasons stated on pages 3-7 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barlent, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). The test for anticipation is symmetrical to the test for infringement and has been stated as: "That which would literally infringe [a claim] if later in time anticipates if earlier than the date of invention." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 U.S.P.Q. 1931, 1938 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

To support the rejection, the explanation in the Office Action cites Fig. 24-28 as disclosing "the first connecting lines" of the claimed invention. However, Applicants respectfully contend that the rejection details in the Office Action mischaracterize the teachings of Imajo with regard to Fig. 24-28 and do not provide the teaching or explanation as to how Fig. 24-28 discloses "the first connecting lines" of Applicant's claims.

Appl. No. 10/646,008
Response dated: September 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 2, 2005

Imajo describes Fig. 24 and 26-28 at paragraphs [0223]-[0233] and [0241]-[0244]. There does not appear to be a similar description for Fig. 25 in Imajo. Applicant finds no disclosure in Imajo of anything resembling a "connecting line" as claimed, especially in Fig. 24-28. The Office Action does not state with specificity where in Imajo or what features of Fig. 24-28 disclose the "connecting line" of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not met the burden required under §102 for establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Thus, Imajo does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, "a plurality of first connecting lines disposed between the first driving signal wire and a part of the first display signal wire, and connected to at least one of the first driving signal wire and the part of the first display signal wire" as recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, Imajo does not disclose all of the limitations of at least amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Imajo does not anticipate amended Claim 1. Claim 1 is not further objected or rejected and Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-5, 7-15 and 18-22 also rejected in view of Imajo. However, these claims variously depend from allowable Claim 1 and are thus correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18-22 is thus respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/646,008
 Response dated: September 2, 2005
 Reply to Office action of June 2, 2005

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application. Applicant hereby petitions for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By  Jae Y. PARK

Ltd. Recognition No. L0077
 Cantor Colburn LLP
 55 Griffin Road South
 Bloomfield, CT 06002
 PTO Customer No. 23413
 Telephone: (404) 607-991
 Fax: (404) 607-9981

Date: September 2, 2005